1892-93
(L.R.)

File No. 189-92
Serial No 1-9

P-44

Sub - Complaint of Venkataramana Bhatta & against the agent of mole halli & Villages Commanded by the Hemagiri Channel.

1892-93.

190

(~~Rev. Jud.~~ L – R.)

1892-93

~~1~~ File No. ~~241 of~~ 1892-93

Serial Nos. 1–9

Previous references.

Rev: Mis. 32 of 1890-91

Later references.

Rev: Mis. 228 of 1895-96
and
Rev: Mis. 160 of 1894-95

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Remarks

Serial Nos. 1–9

Part B. ~~for~~

SUBJECT.

Complaint of Venkatanarana ~~Bhatta~~ against the agent of Melhalli &c, villages commanded by the Hemagiri ~~channel~~.

1 From Venkatanarana ~~Bhatta~~ Pet. No. 2284 & No 2295 d/ the 1.3.93 and 8.3.93 resp^ly
Complains that order ~~d/~~ No 11566 / P.T. 261-92 d/ the 3.5.93 does not finally dispose of his complaint against the agent Venkataramaniya and prays that the agent be removed & his security amount taken from him.

✓ 2 To the Dy Comr Mysore No 15901 d/ the 28.3.93
Forwards the petitions for report with reference to certain points

✓ 3 From the Dy Comr Mysore No 998 d/ the 9.3.94
Submits his report

✓ 4 To the Dy Comr Mysore No 650 d/ the 10.7.94 on his part
Rejects the petition as to removal of the agent as no fraud has been proved, and the other ~~bills~~ charges except ~~bill~~ as to no complaint against the agent and as to security directs the Dy Comr to remove him if he does not give security within a reasonable time.

G. ~~Pl~~S. 58

✓ 5 To the Dy Comr Mysore No 2926 d/ the 20.8.94
Requests the forwardal of the enclosures appearing to have been sent

6 From the Dy Comr Mysore No 225 dy the 29.8.94
Requests the forwardal of the petition of Venkatanarayanappa for reference

7 To the Dy Comr Mysore No 4327 dy the 10.9.94
Forwards the petition as requested

8 From the Dy Comr Mysore No 385 dy the 4.10.94
Forwards the enclosures called for

9 To Venkatanarayana Bhatta Endt No 2243, 2279 and 2277 dy the 25.10.94
Intimates the Govt order No 650 dy the 10.7.94

(General Serial No. 32.)

1893.

No. 2284

Name of Petitioner. Venkatramanabhatta
Vaidya of Melkote

Village.

Taluk. Krishnarajpet.

District. Mysore

Date of Arzi. 1-3-93

Date of Receipt. 6-3-93

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. Nil

ABSTRACT.

Complains that order No: 11566 / P.T. 241-92 dated 3d/Jany 1893, does not finally dispose of his Complaint agt. the Agent Venkataramanah of Melkote for misappropriation of revenue & misdirection of false accounts - Prays that the records may be perused, & the Agent summoned or his Security withheld pending [illegible] 8. March 9/3/93 [illegible]

Mysore Govt. Central Press, Bangalore—7-9-92,—1000.

Petn Bo
1/3/93

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE
PETITION DEPARTMENT
REG'D. NO. 2284 B
DATE 6-3-93

(39)

To.

Sir K. Seshadri Iyer K.C.S.I
Dewan to H.H. the Maharaja
of Mysore.

The humble petition of
Venkatanarasimhatta, Vrittidar of
Gelhalli, Krishtarajapete Taluq
respectfully showeth.

That your honors petitioner
filed an appeal in your honors
office on the 2d December 1890,
complaining that the agent
Venkatarangaiya who was appointed
by Government misappropriated
the revenue of Gelhalli, furnished
false accounts to petitioner and failed
to discharge his duties properly.

That your honors petitioner
was favored with Endorsement No
2243 dated 3d January 1893 referring
him to the Deputy Commissioner

to whom orders had been issued. He applied for, and obtained, a copy of the order issued to the Deputy Commr viz:- No 11566 / Rt. F. 241-92 dated 30 January 1893.

That in the first paragraph of the above order a part of the petitioner's Complaint is merely stated; but the evidences contained in the appeal petition and its enclosures do not seem to have received your honor's attention..

That the rest of the order wholly relates to Yachamanahalli. The last paragraph of the order runs thus:— "the village being is under Government management, the former agent must act in its subordination to Government officers. The proper accounts must be kept and passed by the Revenue officers of Government, and they will be open to the inspection of the Vrittidars at stated hours". This obviously refers to Yachamanahalli which alone is under Government management. The petitioner begs to remind your honor that his Complaint relates

not to Yachamanahalli village but to Dielhalli. He cannot, therefore, understand how can this be the final order in his case, nor can he see what the Deputy Commissioner can do for him under this order. The petitioner humbly begs your honour to be kind enough to examine the records of his case.

The agent has given security to Government in Rs 2000/- for the due discharge of his duties; and the Surety has executed a Muchalika binding himself to pay to Government Rs 2000/-, in case the agent should fail to discharge any of his duties properly. The petitioner has shown in his appeal petition that the agent has not duly discharged any of his duties. The Deputy Commissioner states in his report that, in the interest of the Vrittidars, the present agent who has not acquitted himself properly in the discharge of his duties, should be removed from office. (Please see the above mentioned order para 3)

In

In Conclusion, the petitioner humbly prays that your honor will be kind enough to order the security amount to be produced & to remove the agent from office.

For which act of kindness he ever prays.

Bangalore
18th March 1898

Reference

(Initialled) M. A.

8/3/93.

Refer Mr. with subjoined Memo to the Chief Secretary, as directed by the Under Secretary. 13/3

The Petitioner, as one of the 4 Vrittidars of the Inam Village of Melkalli in the Krishnarajpet Taluk, complains of the Agent appointed to manage the affairs of the village, having been negligent in the discharge of his duties and of his having misappropriated a portion of the revenues of the village & given false accounts to the Petitioner. The village is not under Govt. management, but the Agent is said to have been appointed by the Deputy Commr. and to have given security for the proper performance of his duties under the Rules issued with Cir. No. 3237 of 19 28 Sept. 1871

Petitioner states that he at first instituted criminal Proceedings against the Agent, that on the enquiry before the Subordinate Magr. was defective he made application to the District Magr. (Mr. Anundaraw) and that that Officer directed the Sub Dn. Offr. to examine the accounts of the village & dispose of the matter on the Revenue side. The Dist. Magr. is said to have made the following observations:— "The Agent was appointed or recognised by the Govt. and holds his office in a manner on Govt. support. In the public interest it behoves the Sub Divn. Officer to hold the Jamabandi of the village this season, to strike the accounts up to date & allow the Complainant a free examination of them. The Jamabandi of the village was however not conducted by the Sub Divl. probably because the village was not under Govt. management

(P.T.O.)

(General Serial No. 32.)

1893

No. 2295

Name of Petitioner. Venkatanarana Bhatta Vrittidar of Melkalli, Krishnarajpet Taluk

Village. Bangalore

Taluk.

District.

Date of Arzi. 8/3/93

Date of Receipt. Do.

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures.

ABSTRACT.

In reply to his appeal of 2nd December 90, Petr. was given endorsement No. 2 C.S. referring him to the Dy. Com. to whom orders have been issued. Petitioner states that the order issued to the Dy. Com. relates to Yachamanahalli which is under Govt. management, and not to his Inam village Melkalli with which his appeal is connected. He prays that, as it is clear from the records and the Dy. Comm's report that the agent has not discharged his duties properly, the Surety for the agent may be ordered to produce the

Mysore Govt. Central Press Bangalore—7-9-92,—1000.

depn. by amount = Rs 2000 =, and
that the agent may be removed
from office as recommended
by the depty Commr

Dl. 8/3.

appeared. The Petitioner states
that Iam merely recorded the
orders of the agent & Pet= and mb=
to the Dy Commr & that thereupon
Dy Comr (Mr Meiklejohn) referred the
to the Civil Court for the recovery
money due to him.
Petitioner thereupon appealed to the
for redress in the Rev. Dept.
Agent happened to be in
of other Inam villages, one of
Yachamanhalli was under
agement, and as para 2 of
Petition was so worded as
that Petitioners complaints referred
Yachamanhalli, the enquiries made
office No. 854 dy 9-1-91, the report
the Dy Comm= in his letter dtd
22nd May 91, and the orders
No. 11566 dy 16-1-92, had reference
R.T. 241-92
Melhalli, and not to Melhalli
conduct as to the management
which is in question.
Petitioner, in his Petition urges
his appeal relates to Melhalli
not to Yachamanhalli, and prays
due notice may be taken of the
agents misconduct, and orders issued
the dismissal of the Agent & the production
the Security Amount. It may here
noted that from the tenour of para 6 C
the appeal Pet= it could be inferred
Petitioners appeal referred to Melhalli
that in 5 Reminder Petitions addressed
him he referred expressly to Melhalli alone

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

The questions for consideration are:—

(1) Whether the Agent Venkat-
-ramanya was appointed
manager of the village of
Melhalli by the Dy Commr
under the authority vested in him
by Rule II of the Rules issued
with Cir. No 3237/19 of 28-9-71

(2) Whether any & if so what,
security was given by the Agent
under the said rule for the
due discharge of his duties.

(3) Whether the Agent was guilty
of acts which would justify
the enforcement of the penal
clauses of the security bond
& if so, what were they & when
committed.

(4) Whether the appointment
of the Manager was renewed
annually at the direction of
the Deputy Commr as required
by the said Rule, ~~&~~

(5) ~~Whether~~ Whether the engage-
-ment of the surety was subsisting
on the date of the commission
of the acts referred to & ~~what relief, if any is~~ to which he is entitled to get
in the Revenue department.

(6) ~~What relief, if any is~~ Let the entitled to get

The papers relating to the appointment of Venkatramanya as Manager of Melhalli, and the muchalikas, if any, executed by the Manager & his Surety are not on the file, nor is there before Government any report of the local authorities on the

The Dy Com may be asked to report on the above points & forward the muchalikas & other papers.

15/5/72

questions referred to.

13/3. In order of Smeilen (Jnr E)

1873

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.
PETITION DEPARTMENT.
REGD. NO. 2295 R
DATE 8/3/93.

40

To,

Sir. K. Sheshadri Iyer K.C.S.I.,
Dewan Bahadur to
H. H. the Maha Raja
of Mysore.

The humble petition of Venkata-Narana Bhatta Vrittidar of Melkalli Krishna Raja-peta Talut respectfully showeth:—

That the petitioner filed in your honour's office an appeal on the 2nd December 1890, complaining that the agent Venkata Ramiah who was appointed by Government misappropriated the revenue of Melkalli, furnished false accounts to the petitioner and failed to discharge his duties properly.

That the petitioner was favoured with Endorsement No. 2243 dated 3rd

3rd January/93 referring him to The Deputy Commissioner to whom orders had been issued. He applied for, and obtained, a copy of the order issued to The Deputy Commissioner, namely, No. 11566 Pet. F. 241-92 dated 3rd January/93.

That in the first paragraph of the above order a part of the petitioner's complaint is merely stated, but the evidences contained in the appeal petition and its enclosures do not seem to have received your Honour's attention.

That the rest of the order entirely relates to Yachamánahalli. The last paragraph of the order runs thus:- "The Village being under Government Management, the former agent must act in subordination to the Government officers. The proper accounts must be kept and passed by the revenue officers of Government, and they will be open to the inspection of the Vrittidars at stated hours...." This

obviously

obviously refers to Yachamanahalli which alone is under Government management. Petitioner begs to remind your honour that his complaint relates not to yachamanahalli but to Hirehalli. He cannot therefore understand how this can be the final order in his case nor can he see what the Deputy Commissioner can do for him under this order. The petitioner humbly begs your honour to be kind enough to examine the records of his case.

The agent has given security to Government in Rs 2000/- for the due discharge of his duties. The surety has executed a Mutchilika binding himself to pay to Government Rs 2000/- in case the agent should fail to discharge any of his duties properly. The petitioner has shown in his appeal petition that the agent has not duly discharged any of his duties. The Deputy Commissioner states in his report to Government that in the interest of the Vrittidars the present

agent

agent who has not acquitted himself properly in the discharge of his duties should be removed from office. (Vide the above order, para 3)

In conclusion, the petitioner humbly begs that your honour will be kind enough to order the security amount to be produced and to remove the agent from office.

For this act of kindness, he shall ever pray.

ಕ್ಕೊ ಕ್ಕೆ ಇಂಗ್ಕಗ್ಗಿ ಕ್ಕೆ ಇ
ಇ ಕ್ಕೆ ಸ

8th Mar/93.

No. 34, Budamanpet
Bangalore.

(General Serial No. 30.)

1893

From

The Chief Secretary
to the Dewan of Mysore.

To

The Deputy Commr
Mysore Dist

Dated 21st March

Despatched 28th March

Received

Enclosures No. Two petitions

General No. 15701
Pet: No. 241-92

References to be marked.

Mysore Govt. C. Press, Bangalore.—9-1-93.—3,000.

Read. —

(1) Petition No 2295 dated 8th March 1893 from Venkatramma-bhatta one of the Vuttidars of Malhalli in the Krishnarajpet Taluk.

(2) Proceedings No 11566/P.T.24192 dated 3d. January last

Order

No 15901/Pet 1226/T. 24-92

The Petitioner states that his appeal, dated the 2d December 1892, upon which the order No 11566/P.T.24192 was passed, did not relate to the management of Yachamanhalli, dealt with in the order, but to the misconduct of Venkatramma, agent for Yachamanhalli and other villages, in his capacity as manager of Malhalli, and prays that the said Venkatramma be removed from the office of manager of Malhalli and that the amount of his ~~the~~ security ~~given by him be~~ ordered to be produced

2. The [illegible] the order referred to was passed, related to the management of Yachamanahalli, as portions of the Petitioners appeal contained allusions to it and Petitioner was understood to complain of Venkatarāmiā's conduct in regard to Yachamanahalli.

3. The Deputy Commissioner is now requested to submit a report as early as practicable on the following points:-

(1) Whether the agent Venkatramia was appointed manager of the village of Malhalli by the Deputy Commr. under the authority vested in him by Rule II of the Rules issued with Cov: No 3237/19 of 28-3-11.

(2) Whether any, and if so what, security was given by the Agent under the said rule for the due discharge of his duties,

(3) Whether the Agent was guilty of such misconduct as would justify the enforcement of the penal clauses of the

Refer para 3 of the present petition

~~what were they, and when committed~~

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

(4) Whether the appointment of the Manager was renewed annually at the direction of the ~~Deputy~~ Commissioner as required by the said Rule.

(5) Whether the engagement of the surety was subsisting on the date of the commission of the ~~acts~~ unlawful acts imputed ~~referred~~ to, and

(6) What relief, if any, is Petitioner entitled to get in the Revenue Department.

~~4.~~ The Deputy Commissioner is further requested to submit the proceedings of the case with the papers relating to the appointment of Venkatramia as manager of Malkalli, and the Muchilikas, if any, executed by the Manager and his surety.

5. The Petition of appeal dated 2d Dec. 1890, and the Ltr of 8th March 1893 are sent for reference & should be returned with the report called for.

Draft
(Commissioner's order)
S.V.

23/3

Chief Secretary

(General Serial No. 30.)

1894.

13731
Pet: 617

From

The Deputy Commissioner -
Mysore District.

To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan
of Mysore.

Dated

9th March 1894.

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No. Four files of correspondence marked A.B.C. and D. and 3 petitions Nos 2277, 2243, & 2295

General No.

No. 998

Reporting upon the petitions from Venkatanarana Bhatta, Vrittidar of Melkalli; Krishnarajpet Ta together with the papers called for

Submitted for orders, with reference to the order on the office note on Petn No 2295 (Paper 40) in the file -

Order

No misappropriation of the Revenues collected by the Manager Venkataramiah being proved, & the several bearers excepting Pattadar having no complaint against him, I do not consider it necessary to direct his removal, but he is bound under the rules to give security & if he fails to furnish the same with a reasonable time, the Dy Comr should be requested to remove him & appoint another who is willing to give the security.

17/6/94

Draft 20/6/94

Draft 30/6 Sd 30/6

Rec'd 13/3/94.

No. 998.

Four files of correspondence marked A. B. C and D, and three petitions Nos. 2277, 2243 and 2295 -

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE,
MYSORE DISTRICT,

Dated Mysore 9th March 1894.

From

A. Rangasamy Iyengar Esq. B.A.B.L.
Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District.

To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore,

SIR,

With reference to Government Proceedings no: 16-901/1227 dated 21st March 1893, and official memorandum no: 241-92 dated 14th February 1894, calling for a report on the queries therein asked regarding the appointment of Venkatanarainiah as Agent of the Melkalli Inam village, Krishnarajpet Taluk, I have the honor to submit herewith copy of the letter and memorandum files of correspondence marked A to D received from the Sub-Division officer, French

French Rocks, and to state that on a careful perusal of all the papers I find that there is nothing for me to add to what has been stated by the said Officer.

2 The security bond B is which is dated 19th February 1876, has not been registered and is therefore ineffective, as regards the liability of the landed properties assigned to collateral security for the amount. The Agent Venkatanarasiah is to be blame in not having produced a fresh security on being called upon to do so by the Bailiff, and steps will be taken, on receipt of Government orders, to enforce the same or to deal with the matter as it deserves under the rules of 1871.

3. The report called for regarding the difference in accounts of Maddika Yachamanahalli in Government Proceedings no: 11566/241-92 dated 3rd January 1893 has not been received from the Sub-Division Officer and will be submitted on receipt. The petitions, 3 in number, received with the order of reference are herewith retransmitted.

4. I regret the delay that has occurred owing to the vernacular papers having been transmitted by parcel post by the Sub-Division Officer instead having been misplaced in Office. The Official that is responsible will be found

found out and punished.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obed.t Servant

H. Armitage
for Depty Commissioner
MM Dmg one Dollar

Compd.
Wm.

From

The Sub-Division Officer

Forest Rocks.

To

The Deputy Commissioner

Mysore District

Sir,

With reference to your docket no: 5-46 dated 5th April 1893 giving cover to copy of Government Proceedings no: 15-901/1223 of 2nd march 1893 and calling for a report on the queries therein asked, I have the honor to report as follows:—.

I. Whether the agent on Venkabarania was appointed manager of the village of Mellally by the Deputy Commissioner under the authority vested in him by rule II of the rules issued with circular no: 3237/19 dated 28th September 1871?

Yes, Vide vernacular correspondence ending with Attikuppa Annadani's report no: 165 dated the 18th June 1876, marked 'A'.

cured by the Security Bond Ramappa bindings himself to pay Rs 2,000/- in case of default, is submitted in original. This is marked B.

No Mubchalika was taken from the agent himself.

The present petitioner charged the agent in April 1885 with Criminal breach of trust before the 1st class Magistrate in respect to the revenues of his village payable to him. Mr. Sreenivasaiengar after going into the case with the record of a preliminary enquiry held by the Amildar, dismissed the complaint under

so what security was given by the agent in the said sale for the due discharge of his duties?

3. Whether the agent was guilty of such misconduct as would justify the enforcement of the penal clauses of the Security bond?

Civil Procedure Code.
The petitioner again
presented a petition
in October 1886, accusing
the agent of misap-
-propriating 80 and
odd rupees, which he
had recovered through
the Civil Court. This
was referred by the
District magistrate to
one Nanjundiah 1st
class magistrate who
enquired into the case,
and held the com-
-plaint to be of a
civil nature. The
petitioner again prayed
the District magistrate
to order further en-
-quiry into the case.

The Distt. Magistrate for reasons set forth in the order in Criminal Mis case No. 74 of 1886 refused to order further enquiry into the complaint, unless the

petitioner specified
the amount said
to have been mis-
-appropriated

cient proofs for the trial and instructed the Sub-Division Officer to examine the accounts of the village on the revenue side, to ascertain whether the petitioner was defrauded by the agent as alleged or not. Vide file marked C.

The Amildar was directed to examine the accounts kept by the agent and bound them to be produced and re-adjusted daily. The Amildar thereupon got the accounts newly prepared by the agent. The petitioner was then allowed

the

the accounts with regard to his com-plaint. The petitioner was unable to point out the amount said to have been appropri-ated. He was therefore left to seek his redress in the best way he could, in a compe-tent Civil or Revenue Court and papers connected with the case were submitted to the Deputy Commis-sioner. Vide vernac-ular correspondence marked D.

Thus it will be seen that the only thing elicited by the com-plaint of the peti-tioner was that the accounts were with

which were however rectified by the Auildars; but there were no traces of any criminal misappropriation in them so as to enforce the penal clauses of the Security bond against him. Generally with the exception of the present petitioner, none of the great body of the other Vaillidars have protested against the conduct of the agent.

No.

4 Whether the appointment of the manager was renewed annually at the direction of the Deputy Commissioner as required by the said rule?

ment of the Surety was subsisting on the date of commission of the wrongful acts imputed to the agent?

originated in 1880. Surety Ramappa died some years before that period. After the death of the Surety the agent was called upon by the Buildar to produce another Surety, and he failed to do so.

The remaining correspondence relating to the appointment of Venkatarama and complaint of the petitioner together with the petitions received with the documents under reply are submitted herewith, by parcel post.

I have &c—

(Sd) Mahamed Ali
Sub-Division Peer
Ginnah Rocks

Copy.
K Ramanujachar
for Deputy Commissioner
Bangalore Division
Compd.

Proceedings of the Govt of H. H. the Maharaja Jeypore

Read:—

Petitions registered Nos 2295 dated 8th March 1893, 2243 dated 11th January 1893 and 2277 dated 31st January/94 from Venkat Narana bhatta one of the Vuttidars of the Inam village of Melhalli, Krishnaraj pett Taluk, complaining that Venkataramia the Manager of the village, has been negligent in the discharge of his duties, that he misappropriated a portion of the revenues of the village and gave false accounts to the petitioner

2 Govt. Proceedings No 15901 Pet 7241 dated 21st March 1893, calling for a report regarding the authority under which Venkataramiah was appointed, whether any security was furnished by him, whether he was guilty of the charges brought against him and whether his appointment was renewed every year.

(3) Letter No 998 dated 9th March 1894 from the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore with submitting the papers connected with the case, and reporting that Petitioner was appointed under Rule II of the rules issued with Circular No $\frac{3237}{19}$ of 28th Septr 1871 that Petitioner's surety Narnappa Executed a bond which ~~was~~ is useless as it was not registered, that petitioner failed to prove the charges against the agent and that the appointment ~~of~~ the agent was not renewed annually as directed by the rules.

(4) The Proceedings in the case

Order thereon No $\frac{650}{\text{Pet F. } 241\text{-}92}$ dt $\frac{10\text{-}7\text{-}94}{20.}$

No misappropriation of the Revenues collected by the Manager Venkatramana ~~is~~ having been proved, and the several shares

Excepting petitioner having no complaint against him, Government do not consider it necessary to direct his removal; but he is bound, under the rules, to give security; and if he fails to furnish the same within a reasonable time, the Deputy Commr will be requested to remove him and appoint another who is willing to give the security

Chief Secretary

Redraft

CP
877094

All 1077

To
The Deputy Commr
Mysore District

returning the very papers received with his No 998 dated 3 March 94 (council order)

S. Rice

E.J.

Sir

O. In. 854 of 19/1/91
is the reference marked
19 in the file.

Rec'd
24/7/94.

Draft a docket
to the Commr
Depot requesting
him to send
him the enclosures
of Feb 6 if
they have been sent
under Or. 854

WJ 17/8 Drafted
18/8 sent

To

The Dy. Commr.

Mysore Districts

Dated 20/21/8/94 2926
No P.F 24+32

This Office O.M. No. 854
dated 19 January 1891 for-
-warding the petition
registered No. 2243 dated
2d Dec. 1890 from Venkata-
-ramana Khatta Vutti-
-dar of Melkalli, Krishna-
-rajapet Taluk.

With reference to the above
has the honr to request
that the enclosures to
the petition above referred
to may be returned
to this Office at a very
early date ~~if they are~~
~~in the Dy. Commrs Office~~
as they have not been
received from him ~~office~~ though
they appear to have been sent with
the official Memorandum 854 dated 19-1-91
to this Office

By order

Chief Clerk

Draft
SKR.
18/8

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

From

The Chief Secretary to the
Dewan of Mysor

To

Dated

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No.

General No.
No.

No. 225

Deputy Commissioners Office
Mysore District
9/2/1892

From,

A. Rungaswamy Iyengar Esqre B.A.L.
Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

To,

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan
of Mysore
Bangalore

Sir,

With reference to your docket No. 2926 / 24.1.92 dated the 20th Instant, I have the honor to request that you will be so good as to forward for reference, the petition of Venkatarama Bhatta, Vrittidar of Melkully, in order to see what enclosures there were in it, as none appear to have been retained in this office, while submitting the Petition with this office letter No. 171, dated 22nd May 1891.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obed't Serv't

A. Rungaswamy
Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

Compd.
Files

(General Serial No. 30.)

2859.
31 AUG. 94
Pl: 154

189 4

From The Dy Commissioner Mysore

To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

Dated 29 August '94

Despatched 30

Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 2,225
No.

Requests that the petition of Venkatanarana Bhatta, Melhalli Vrittidar, may be forwarded for reference

Sent petition
VJ.6/9

Read
31/8/94

Read
1/9/94

(General Serial No. 30.)

189

From

To The Dt Comr
Mysore

Dated 8.9.94

Despatched 10.9.94

Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 4327

No. P.7.241-92

57

The Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

8/8-9-94 / 9-9-94

No. 4327 / Pet.F.241-92 Encl Petn No 2243 & 2/9/94

His letter No. 225 dated 29th August/94 requesting that the petition of Venkatnaranabhatta Vrittidar of Melkalli, may be forwarded to him for reference.

—

Has the honour to forward herewith the petition referred to as requested

By order

Chief Secretary

Draft

7/9

(General Serial No. 30.)

1894.

4760
7 OCT. 94
Pet. 537

From

The Dy Commissioner
Mysore Distt

To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan
of Mysore.

Dated 4/10/94

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No. 5

General No.
No. 385

Retransmits petition of Venkatanaraabhatta, Vritti-dar of Mellahalli, together with its 4 encls.

4/10/94

15/10

Petition to be put up with the Office file.

The enclosures thereof recd herewith to be returned to Petr Venkat-narrabhatta with the fair copy of the endorsement dated 10th July 1894, which remains in the file undespatched pending result of search for the enclosures, & which should now be despatched without further delay—

20/10.

24/10

Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

No 385

Dated Mysore 4th October 1894.

From

A. Rangaswami Iyengar Esquire
Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

52

To

The Chief Secretary to the
Dewan of Mysore

Sir

I have the honor to retransmit herewith the petition of Venkatavararanbhatta, Vrithidar of Mellahalli, dated 2-12-90 received with your docket no: 4327/7.241-92 dated 8th September 1894 together with a file of enclosures containing exhibits marked 1. 2. 4 and 5 in the petitioner's list. The file was found on a search among the English Records, made after the receipt of the above petition.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant

Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

Compd

No. 2295, 2295 + 2277 Serial 9 25-10-94

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

10-7-1894
25+10

Endorsement granted to Venkatasamana Khalla Vuttidar of the Inam village of Melkalli Krishna Rajapet Taluk.

in reply to his Petition Registered No.s 2295+2277 dated 11.1.93, 8.3.93 + 31-1-94 complaining of the mis management of the village by the agent of Devitcap Venkataramiah & praying for his removal

Petitioner is informed that no misappropriation of the Revenues collected by the manager Venkataramiah having been proved and the several sharers excepting Petitioner having no complaint against him, Govt. do not consider it necessary to direct his removal.

2. The Enclosures are returned,

"By Order"

Chief Secretary.

M. G. C. P., Bangalore—6-3-94.—2000.